

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF
SOUTH CAROLINA
DOCKET NO. 90-815-C - ORDER NO. 91-1131 ✓
DECEMBER 16, 1991

IN RE: Request of Southern Bell Telephone) ORDER
and Telegraph Company for Approval) GRANTING
of Revisions to its General) MOTION
Subscriber Service Tariff.)

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the Commission) on the Petition for Reconsideration or Oral Argument filed December 9, 1991, by Steven W. Hamm, Consumer Advocate for the State of South Carolina (the Consumer Advocate). The Consumer Advocate has asked for reconsideration of Commission Order No. 91-1082 in this Docket.

In Order No. 91-1082, issued on December 4, 1991, the Commission denied a motion to consolidate consideration of certain services in this proceeding for which approval had been held in abeyance, with the hearing set for Caller I.D. in Docket No. 89-638-C. These services include Bulk Calling Line Identification (BCLID), Automatic Number Identification (ANI), Call Detail Information (CDI), and Simplified Message Desk Interface (SMDI). Order No. 91-1082 held that sufficient and substantial evidence was presented at the hearing on April 11, 1991, to enable the Commission to make a decision on the issue of whether Southern Bell

should be allowed to implement BCLID, ANI, CDI and SMDI, and that no additional evidence was necessary.

The Consumer Advocate asserts that in making these findings, the Commission has misapprehended the Consumer Advocate's request. The Consumer Advocate states that he has no desire to present additional evidence in this proceeding. The Commission has agreed to consider the issue of what rights Southern Bell customers should have to control dissemination of their telephone numbers to subscribers of Caller I.D. service after the hearing in Docket No. 89-638-C. The Consumer Advocate states that since the services BCLID, ANI, CDI, and SMDI in the present docket provide, in his words, "essentially the same information to subscribers of those services, the Commission's treatment of any rights to control dissemination of telephone numbers should and must be consistent among all services that provide calling number delivery."


In that regard, the Consumer Advocate requests the opportunity to present oral argument at the hearing on Docket No. 89-638-C, based upon evidence already in the record in this proceeding, as to why the Commission's decision on any rights to control dissemination of telephone numbers should be consistent among all services that provide calling number delivery. The Commission has considered the Consumer Advocate's request for oral argument and believes that it should be granted, for the reasons stated in the Consumer Advocate's Petition for Reconsideration or Oral Argument.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:


1. That the Consumer Advocate's Motion to present oral arguments at the hearing in Docket No. 89-638-C, based upon the evidence already in the record in this proceeding as to why the Commission's decision on any rights to control dissemination of telephone numbers should be consistent among all services that provide calling number delivery, is hereby granted. The Consumer Advocate will have ten (10) minutes to present his argument at the conclusion of the hearing. The Company will then have ten (10) minutes to respond. The Consumer Advocate will then have five (5) minutes to reply to the Company's response.

2. That this Order shall remain in full force and effect until further Order of the Commission.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:


VICE Chairman

ATTEST:


Deputy Executive Director

(SEAL)